

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] have a request at this time?

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE FOR 1 MINUTE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be able to address the House for 1 minute on this particular issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. TIAHRT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do we not have 5 minutes coming up now where everybody is going to get a turn to speak?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain 1-minute speech requests.

Mr. TIAHRT. I object, Mr. Speaker. Let us go to the 5 minutes and continue the business of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

FURTHER REQUEST AND CLARIFICATION OF PROCEDURE

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my motion to adjourn.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, if I may be heard, I think there was a misunderstanding of what the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] was attempting to do. I think it would be very helpful, perhaps, if the Speaker would now recognize the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] and let him renew his unanimous-consent request. I think we can move along.

INTRODUCTION OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION TO REMOVE PROVISION FOR SPECIAL TAX BREAK FOR RUPERT MURDOCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] renew his request?

Mr. DEUTSCH. Yes. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. DEUTSCH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, along with many Members, I believe, a sustainable one-third vote, a concurrent resolution to take out the provision that gives a special tax break to Rupert Murdoch for \$63 million. At a time when we are cutting back on student loans, student work programs, student lunch programs, to do a thing that is just sleazy, it looks sleazy, it smells sleazy, it walks sleazy, it talks sleazy, and it is sleazy, and it is just something that this House, the greatest deliberative body in the world, should not be part of.

We have the opportunity to correct our actions. I urge the House tomorrow, I urge the leadership of this body, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], specifically, who has said that he is against this particular provision, let him speak in deeds, not just words.

I do not think there is one person in the entire country that believes that Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN was the impetus. We know that is not how this process works. The Speaker's relationship with Mr. Murdoch is clearly something that has been well documented in the press. I urge the support of both parties with the concurrent resolution tomorrow.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE ON HOUSE OVERSIGHT FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 70 AND REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on House Oversight be discharged from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 70, and that the joint resolution be re-referred to the Committee on Resources.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5, 1995, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, the Committee on Commerce, the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, the Committee on House Oversight, the Committee on International Relations, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Small Business, and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is my understanding that the Minority has been consulted and that there is no objection to these requests.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have checked with the ranking members of each of those committees and subcommittees, and they have agreed to that.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BONIOR addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE TAX CUT PACKAGE IS GOOD FOR THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon because Americans are overtaxed. Because of this, I support my colleague Mr. ARCHER's bill to lower taxes.

There is a growing realization in this country that we cannot afford to operate on deficit budgets. We spend too much money primarily because we are involved, at the Federal level, in too many things. If we really want to control spending, we must come to grips with the fact that the Government is entirely too big. Day after day, special interest groups file through this city claiming that they understand the need to reduce Federal spending but that their program only costs a little relative to the size of the budget. This reminds me of the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers' boast that progress is being made regarding the size of the national debt as it relates to the national economy, while the national debt gets larger and larger and larger. These interest groups, and some of my colleagues, are missing the point. Government is too big.

But the mindset that still has a formidable presence in Congress is to see how little in Federal spending we can get away with cutting. Oh, they say, the voters are really mad about the deficit and debt, so we'll have to cut some things, but maybe not too much. Even among Members who say they want a balanced budget, there seems to be a large group that isn't interested in cutting \$1 more than needed to do this.

The chief reason why there is resistance to cutting taxes, even among those who campaigned in favor of tax cuts, is that if you cut taxes, but are striving for a balanced budget, you have to cut spending that much more. The current argument against cutting taxes is that it is irresponsible to do so in the face of a \$5 trillion national debt. My response is this: We have this debt not because of the tax rate but because of this body's insatiable lust for spending. What is irresponsible is for